

THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF LA HABRA  
September 16, 2020

**THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WAS CONDUCTED TELEPHONICALLY VIA ZOOM. The public was able to participate by either calling in or sending an email.**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Nigsarian called the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra to order at 6:30 p.m. The Commissioners, the public and Staff conducted the meeting telephonically through Zoom and live streamed through YouTube.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** LED BY COMMISSIONER POWELL

**PRESENT: (via Zoom)** COMMISSIONERS: NIGSARIAN  
MANLEY  
POWELL  
MUNOZ  
BERNIER

**ABSENT:** COMMISSIONERS: NONE

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

DIR. OF COMM. DEV.: HO  
PLANNING MANAGER: RAMSLAND  
SENIOR PLANNER: SCHAEFER  
ASSOCIATE PLANNER: LOPEZ  
CITY ATTORNEY: SERITA YOUNG  
CITY ATTORNEY: GINETTA GIOVINCO  
METIS: LLOYD ZOLA  
PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY: GONZALEZ  
COMM. DEV. SECRETARY: LOPEZ  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: HURT

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

The Chair reconvened the public hearing on the Rancho La Habra Project.

1. Consideration of a request for Final Environmental Impact Report 18-01 (SCH No 2015111045); General Plan Amendment 18-01 to change the land use designation from Open Space to Low Density Residential (0-8 units/acre) for Planning Areas 2, 3 & 4; Amendment #3 to the La Habra Hills Specific Plan; Adoption of the Rancho La Habra Specific Plan; Zone 18-01 to change the land use designation from La Habra Hills Specific Plan to Rancho La Habra Specific Plan for the area occupied by the Westridge Golf Course; Vesting Tentative Tract Map 17845, Design Review 18-01 through 18-05 for

Rancho La Habra Specific Plan Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6; and Development Agreement 18-01 for the Rancho La Habra Specific Plan at 1400 South La Habra Hills Drive.

The Chair explained how the meeting would be conducted for the evening. He indicated that those speakers who were on the cue to speak at the close of last night's meeting would be allowed to speak and that no additional speakers will be permitted. Following public testimony, the staff would summarize any correspondence received since 5:00 p.m. for the record, and then the Applicant will have an opportunity for rebuttal after which we will close the public hearing. He continued that following the close of public hearing the Commission will enter into deliberations.

Director Ho introduced the City's Special Council Ginetta Giovinco and Serita Young from Richards Watson Gershon.

Ms. Young stated that all were welcomed to speak and were not given any time limits. She indicated that the project had been adequately deliberate, after 8 or more hours of public testimony and that reasonable time management to limit further testimony after yesterday's meeting was permissible.

She reminded the Commission that their role in this project is to make a recommendation to the City Council who will hold another public hearing on the matter and that the public would have additional opportunities to speak on the project.

Chair Nigsarian stated they would continue with the speakers in the order from the waiting list from last night. He asked staff to commence with the next speaker.

Mr. CJ Lees, Chief Development Officer of the Westridge Community Association and volunteer for the Political Action Save La Habra, has been involved for many years because of the industry he works in. He stated he was the former head of land development with Walt Disney Development. Mr. Lees stated he has volunteered his time helping the residents in dealing with this project and that all these folks have expressed themselves well and that they put together a ballot initiative to be voted on in November. He expressed his concerns that this hearing was taking place now when the vote on the initiative was weeks away and that the citizens would voice their vote on what is being decided this evening. That they are concerned as they heard from community members and the frustration there was no closed hearing, no motion yesterday evening or vote on the public hearing.

He stated that it was unfortunate that the meeting was closed to any more speakers, since he believed there were many others to speak. He pointed out that the City chose this type of forum (Zoom) noting that the county changed the guidelines and that the City could have had an in person hearing to listen to all the folks but chose not to do that. Given the many issues, he opined that many residents are hurt and mad. Don't be surprised if they take it out on the Council Members in the upcoming election.

Mr. Lees discussed Lennar's conduct on this proposal and what they had done in the 1990's where they sold a plan to a different Council to build houses and a buffer zone or green belt that was intended to maintain green space between the residents and the shopping district. He discussed the methods and marketing they used when they sold homes and opined that the buyer thought they would benefit but that it never works out with companies such as Lennar. He stated that zoning is the highest promise a city gives to its residents and to have this changed by this developer, it is just so they can get another round of profits.

Chair Nigsarian asked Mr. Lees to focus his comments to the project itself.

Mr. Lees stated the citizens became concerned when Lennar sent a letter to the community with comments about the golf course failing and closing. He said the golf course has never closed and has been busy and he heard the prices have even gone up. Mr. Lees expressed that there were many misrepresentations made by the Lennar. That they were told by Lennar that there is nothing they could do, but the citizens began an initiative process for ballot Measure X and that everyone on the call, except for two, get to vote on this. Mr. Lees then stated that this was the power of the people in its purist form and that they took thousands of signatures to qualify the initiative. He speculated that the developer went to the City Council to say that if they put the initiative on the ballot that they will sue the City. And that it was placed on the ballot and nothing happened.

Chair Nigsarian interrupted Mr. Lees who had been speaking for 20 minutes and asked him to try to be concise. That he focus on the specifics of the project. Mr. Lees questioned why the Chair did not interrupt the other speakers. Mr. Lees then commented on comments on the Measure X and the misleading comments from the developer and affects to the wildlife.

City Attorney Young interrupted Mr. Lees and asked if there were any issues that have not been already brought up by other speakers. Mr. Lees stated that his comments are related to the development and will make it brief. City Attorney Young asked that he make comments brief.

Ms. Darlene Alquiza, referred to comments made by other speakers the day before regarding the toxicity of the land. She stated that she was originally going to speak about the problems of additional traffic however, she spoke on open space and the toxicity of the soil.

She noted that there were studies on children that show that there is a direct correlation between the amount of open space available and how they develop. And that the biggest factor in determining outcomes of children is the size of the parks that are available to them. She stated her belief that it should stay a golf course as it is the safest use of a toxic land because golfers are constantly moving and not spending as many hours there as children would. She stated that the Commission gets to decide on whether or not people will get to live on this land which is considered toxic. She commented she has an advanced degree in human development with special interest in epigenetics and that there

is a finding in science proving that the environment has impact on genetic expression and what one is exposed to affects in a genetic level. She said, imagine the impacts of this decision, of families living on toxic land, playing barefoot on their lawn, dogs smelling the toxic dirt, or if families will be able to plant gardens.

She asked the Commission to consider that when making their decision, that toxic substances do not dissipate over time and stated that it could cause cancer and other illnesses.

Mrs. Shavan Brown, 841 Sandlewood, La Habra, stated that she is also speaking on behalf of her mother Ms. Ruth Brown stating that she did not receive notification regarding the meeting and had only heard about it from a neighbor. She said that she can understand the format for the hearing, due to the pandemic, but felt that the meeting should have been put off until later so that the elderly residents that are not technically savvy could also participate and voice their opinion. She added that many neighbors had asked her to speak on their behalf. Ms. Brown expressed her opposition to the request. She noted that she had seen many changes in the City over the years, some good, some really bad.

That she shares concerns on issues that have already been voiced. She specifically was concerned about the impact on water use, with the drought; and with traffic impacts at Euclid and Imperial, and on Sandlewood where they are currently experiencing problems with parents picking up their kids from the school. She also expressed her concerns with power outages and poor internet service that new homes would bring, along with increase of use of the post office, Police and Fire Departments. She opined that she doesn't see how the City will have more funds to hire more Police and Firemen to deal with the increase of residents. Ms. Brown asked if the City has already decided with regards to this project and why it is so rushed.

Mr. Greg Jones, of Jones Real Estate, stated that the Burch Ford properties were available for affordable housing and that the current zoning of the property would allow such use at a density of up to 50 units per acre. He noted that there are other parcels of property available within the City that were potentially available for housing, including those properties that are less than an acre, but could be considered. He stated his belief that there are alternative properties and alternative solutions.

Mrs. Marie Laveaga, Kinley Street, La Habra, stated she is the President of the La Habra Chamber of Commerce. She commented that at the time the Chair closed the public hearing the previous evenings, there were at least seven business owners who wished to speak in support of the project. That they raised their hands but were not called upon.

Chair Nigsarian explained that on Monday evening, they provided the time for those who wished to speak in support and when he asked if there were additional speakers no further speakers raised their hands and so they moved on to speakers in opposition. He noted that the Commission had received communication that some were unable to connect, and that he took the extra step to allow for those who wished to speak in support, to speak after the opposition's speakers last night.

He understands her concerns, but he has given supporters two opportunities to speak and asked her to limit her comments to the specifics of the project. He added that he cannot add anymore speakers beyond those on the list from last night's meeting. Ms. Laveaga stated that many had hung up after they closed the hearing.

Ms. Laveaga stated that she is in support of this project. Having 400 plus homes in La Habra would bring business to our community, the businesses need that extra income. She stated that those in support of the project were encountering hostility from the opposition and that this has caused many business owners to shy away. As examples, she stated that within the chat during the meeting, she was accused of being "bought off" which she expressed she resented and that another business owner received a threatening letter. Ms. Laveaga commented that there is no need for threats, lying and accusations.

Additionally, she said that she has been in the community for 34 years and enjoys a very comfortable life in La Habra and that spending a few extra minutes or seconds at an intersection to bring in extra business to the community is not much to ask of her. That she will still enjoys the community and enjoys all the amenities stating "...we are not back 30 years ago, we got to move on, grow, develop and bring strength to the community. We are part of Orange County we've got to act like Orange County... act like a little fish in a big pond. Let's grow, let's develop..." She continued that this would help the City bring property tax sales, and money to the community and for those reasons she is very supportive of the development.

She is an outdoors, active person and not a golfer, which is too slow for her, so that presently she cannot use the golf course. That she uses it for business events once a year and other than that she does not. That she is excited about the proposed trails and parks and maybe they are not elite parks as some in opposition have suggested but with the pictures she has seen, she expressed that they look like something she would use, that her family would use. That there are a lot of amenities she is excited about like the new club house and other things this project is offering that she personally is excited about.

Ms. Laveaga asked if she could read some comments from other supporters. Chairman Nigsarian said it should be fine if they were brief. Ms. Laveaga then read a few of the comments she received. She also noted she received two letters she would like to read. City Attorney Young asked that she summarize those comments. Ms. Laveaga then summarized letters she received from Juan Guerrero, and David Ross. Director Ho stated that staff had received the letters and had forwarded them to the Commission.

Ms. Monica Faith, stated she is a former resident of La Habra and moved to Brea four years ago because of no affordable housing available. She expressed it was the best decision of her life. She added they are in an area where there is plenty of open space with large parks down the street and that she is very happy with the decision. She expressed she misses La Habra and loves it and it holds a special place in her heart. She would eventually like to move back but there are no open spaces in La Habra for them to

go and the largest park in the City is La Bonita which is mostly baseball fields. She asked where are their children supposed to play, where are they supposed to go? That this will be the only city that does not have a golf course, the only one that doesn't have a regional park or a larger park for kids with lots of play grounds. Ms. Faith wished to reiterate that this is La Habra's last open space and once built on there will be nothing left. She expressed that it is sad and asked that the Commission consider that.

Ms. Lena Adamo, stated she lives on Wilshire Avenue near Beach and Lambert. She stated she agrees with the comments they have stated the last two nights. That she has lived in La Habra the last eight years and has noticed an increase in the population and traffic over the last three years and that the City is already too crowded. Ms. Adamo stated that she chose to move to La Habra for the peaceful, rural nature and that it was away from the freeways but close to shopping and the medical facilities. She stated "I am a concerned resident and a nurse of 39 years and has witnessed accidents on Beach Boulevard, increase in crime and homelessness and fear these issues will continue to expand if they are not addressed and stopped now." She pleaded to City Officials and City Planners to take heed of their concerns.

Mr. Peter Cruz, lives on Las Lomas Street, La Habra, stated translation services should be available for residents so all can have access and was also concerned with using the Zoom meeting format. He said its important especially for the older residents to be able to participate. He said that he wished to add some points not covered in his letter he previously submitted for the Commission. He noted that many of the issues the residents have shared were related to how they would manage the long-term issues of the general plan, as it relates to the business community and revitalization efforts they would like to see versus not having housing. He stated that he opposes the proposed project on the basis of open space and environmental issues. He stated that the irreversibility of it is a problem for him and that we should respect the open spaces and listen to the residents that live there which will be impacted the most.

He stated that he noticed that none of the City Council Members live near the proposed development, and felt there was an issue about how the citizens are being represented or underrepresented in different parts of the City and that maybe council districts were needed. And he believes that the Save La Habra group are upset because they are not receiving the representation they need. He added that this was the first time he heard of a public hearing in his neighborhood of Las Lomas and lays the responsibility on the City Council to more effectively reach out and communicate with residents about development projects. He stated that there is a need for a park to solve the park deficiency found in the general plan.

He wanted to point out to those listening, that signatories of individuals against Measure X, have made a point to say this is an undesirable development. He noted some of the other "potential" types of projects that have been mentioned that could be placed here instead of housing were just scare tactics by those in favor of the project.

Mr. Cruz stated that he respects the Commission for how they have been dealing with the process for the last three days, and that he hopes they give everyone equal time. He said that the lady from the Chamber of Commerce was out of order as it was not her time to speak. However, he appreciated having a public hearing without a time limit on speakers and that it is important for the listeners to hear all that's going on.

Mr. Benjamin Fan, stated that he believed that one Commissioner could have a possible conflict of interest in terms of making a recommendation or approval by being a real estate professional, that moving forward there will be more homes to sell and that could be an issue if residents find out.

Mr. James Bailey, stated that he was speaking on behalf of himself, his wife, and his son. He said that they were opposed to this residential development due to the negative impact on traffic, public services and the drain on precious resources along with many other consequences. Mr. Bailey expressed he did not think this was prudent given the current worldwide pandemic and similar crises that may follow to promote higher population density and less open spaces. In addition, he said this is too important of an issue to be without a face to face hearing and placing reliance on Zoom or other technology for which many residents are not familiar or proficient and it does not allow for full participation by all affected people. He questioned the validity of the letters of support and opined that the description presented to the signers was misleading. He questioned the timing of the hearings and to let the electorate decide by voting on Measure X.

The Chair then stated they will summarize the written comments and read them into the record after the break. He called for a break at 8:01 p.m. Commissioners reconvened at 8:06 p.m. and asked staff if there were any written comments to read into the record. There were none. The Chair then stated this was the time allowed for the Applicant to provide a rebuttal.

Community Development Director Ho introduced Mr. Andrew Han representing Lennar.

Mr. Andrew Han presented a rebuttal to the issues that had been raised by project opponents during the public hearing. He addressed what he felt were misconceptions about the project and many false statements that needed to be addressed. He addressed the comments that had been raised that Lennar was the master developer of Westridge who reneged on promises. He stated for the record that they were just one of the builders of some of the homes after the project had been fully entitled.

In response to the comments that the project was being pushed on the City, he noted that it had been a collaborative effort with the City and noted that the design of the proposed project had been thoroughly reviewed by City Staff and its experts to assure that it is a quality project and would be the best fit for the community both environmentally and economically. He noted that the terms of the development agreement reflected those

requirements imposed on them. (It should be noted that the development agreement represented their last, best and final offer to the City. City Staff had asked for more).

In response to the many comments regarding overbuilding and the desire to have no more growth in the City, Mr. Han reminded the Commission that housing demand is not going away and that if this project was denied the City would experience growth elsewhere in the City. He noted that this is an opportunity to select quality development that was thoughtful, mitigated and provided robust public benefits.

He presented to the Commission topics where he felt factually incorrect statements had been made by opponents of the project or where clarification was necessary. His PowerPoint slide listed these eight items:

1. Petitions Represent La Habra Support
2. New City park is safe and has been studied extensively
3. New City park is the outcome of extensive multi-year collaboration with the City
4. La Habra tax payers are protected from CFD and Habitat Conservation area
5. Lennar will waive our right to refund of fair share contributions to neighboring cities
6. SB743 analysis is not necessary or appropriate; traffic studies underwent rigorous and multiple reviews and meet CEQA requirements
7. Rancho La Habra generates positive fiscal impacts
8. Public benefits package equal \$90,300 per home

The PowerPoint presentation was presented by Mr. Han and his experts; Dennis Boratynec (Geotechnical Engineer), Pat Murphy (Landscape Architect), Greg Sanders (Attorney – CFD and conservation areas and traffic laws) and Gary Jones (Vice President-Land Acquisition-fiscal benefits and impacts).

After Lennar's comments, the Chair closed the Public Hearing and asked if there were any additional staff comments. Lloyd Zola, the City's consultant that prepared the EIR, expanded and clarified on the traffic mitigation measures, requirements related to California Fish and Wildlife for the conservation area and the management of the contaminated soils. He noted the area in the EIR where these issues had been addressed and briefly discussed the mitigation measures that had been created to address these issues.

He also addressed a letter that had been received during the Public Hearing from the firm of Cotton Shires regarding slope instability. This comment had also been received during the review period for the recirculated EIR. It was regarding key buttresses that had been placed at the site of an old landslide. It will need to be removed during grading. The issue had been addressed and additional mitigation measures had been created in the recirculated EIR and included in the mitigation monitoring plan to ensure slope stability.

After the close of the Public Hearing the Commission discussed the proposed project. Chair Nigsarian's opening remarks were in response to Mr. Han's comment about the Applicant and the City working collaboratively. He stated that it was true and that anytime any applicant makes an application with the City it is by definition a collaborative effort. He also addressed the comments from some of the speakers about the timing of the hearings. He stated that the City is required to process these applications in an expeditious manner and deliberate way and that the timing is not subjective and that the City processes the application without any undo or unjustified delays. He thanked all of the speakers for their participation and for caring about their community.

With regards to the project he commented that overall it is a beautifully designed project with attractive homes and amenities. He noted that the proposed dedications provide a high value to the City and they benefit the entire community. However, he was concerned with the impacts of the project to the City overall and the permanent loss of about 64 acres of open space. He questioned if this was "the best project at this time for this place", is this the highest and best use of the property.

He pointed out that the project as proposed, is in conflict with the current General Plan, AQMD standards, greenhouse gas requirements, SCAG goals and policies and that it is not in total agreement with Fish and Wildlife. He added that the project will add over 4,000 cars to an area already saturated with traffic, with no solutions to reduce traffic now or in the future. He opined that a smaller project that would have included a 9-hole golf course may have been a better fit. He stated that he did not start the hearing with any preconceived ideas, and that after reviewing all of the documentation and listening to the public testimony he believes that this is not "the highest and best use of the land."

Commissioner Munoz concurred with the Chair's statement that the project has many good points and thanked the community for coming out and voicing their opinions. His concerns with the project centered on three things, density, open space and affordability. He stated that looking at those things he did not feel that the project provided a good balance. He noted that Beach Boulevard was a state route and acknowledged that while it is congested, it can support higher densities in that area, but that a more balanced project would have been better. He added that the community is going to change and grow in the future. He invited the public to participate in the upcoming Housing Element update and to voice their opinions to help direct where and how we will grow. He did caution everyone that we have to plan for 800 units during the next cycle and with all the State regulations we may not have as much control as we would like.

Vice Chair Manley stated that he believes that this is not a black and white project. He acknowledged that this has been in the works for a long time and had garnered both support and opposition in the community. He said that he was in support of the proposed General Plan Amendment, but only if there were some modifications to the design.

He noted that the Commission had heard testimony at length that golf play is down and courses are struggling and closing. He continued that the arguments did not seem so much on the closing of the golf course as much as it was on the rezone of open space and other concerns with the development. He stated that in addition to golf play being down we need to recognize that a housing crisis exists especially in California and that this project would address the crises and help the City meet its housing obligations.

He stated that from a land use perspective, he believes this project is consistent with elements of the General Plan, and that one of their most integral parts of their job as a Commission is to look at it from that perspective. The proposed General Plan Amendment would not create any disjointed land use patterns as it is adjacent to other housing and it would also help the City achieve its goal of reaching 2.5 acres of park land per 1,000 residents, that currently no plans are in place to reach that goal, and in fact, this project would exceed that goal. It would also generate a community benefits package that exceeds \$40 million.

He continued that, he had heard significant testimony both in favor and opposition to the project both inside and outside of the community. Including residents of the Westridge neighborhood in support. People that love our City both long term and newer residents have testified that they love living here and raising their family here. But, when their children grow up, where do they go? Families living in the community and surrounding areas that desire to be part of La Habra, have nowhere to go.

He noted that the project includes 125 multifamily units, homes that average between 1,600 and 2,000 square feet that would sell for around \$609,000. He continued that there are only two housing units available in this range in La Habra right now. He pointed out that these would be affordable to a number of La Habra residents, where the average income is \$76,000.

With regard to traffic he pointed out that the EIR indicated around 4,000 new vehicle trips a day which is about a 3 to 4% increase on surrounding intersections. He added that California's population has grown at about 7% so that if you look at this contextually it does not seem that bad. He reiterated that the project includes public benefits that include the use of the club house as a community center, \$1.5 million in cash for community needs, and \$1 million for affordable housing.

He closed by saying that he would like to see the project modified to include a mix of housing types with a mix of smaller units at a lower price point. As La Habra grows into the future the housing crisis is real.

Commissioner Powell's opening remarks were related to the issue of integrity and how he was troubled by the comments made during public comments that this project was a done deal. He noted that as the senior serving member of the Commission he has been aware

of this project since before the current Community Development Director's tenure with the City. He commented that at no time had Council Members, Commissioners, or staff members suggested how he should vote on any project, but instead had been encouraged to do what he felt was right. He said that Council Members past and present have always demonstrated high integrity and he is sure they will do the right thing in this matter. He reminded the audience that the Commissioners are just volunteer citizens trying to review and assess what is best for this area and the community.

As for the proposed project he began by saying that he had live in La Habra a long time and like many of the speakers has seen many changes as the City has grown, and that there will be more as the City continues to grow. He agreed with Commissioner Manley with regards to traffic. He continued that we have known for some time that the majority of the traffic in the City is cut-through traffic from residents of other cities passing through La Habra to get to the freeways that surround us. He pointed out that this is out of the City's control but that many people at Caltrans and the City have been trying in good faith to mitigate the problem. He spoke briefly about neighborhood traffic calming measures.

He also agreed with Commissioner Manley that there is a housing shortage, particularly in the affordable range and that it is so limited in our City it is a bad comment on the community.

Items on this specific project that troubled him were the 6-year build out period and what that is going to look like and how it would affect the surrounding neighborhoods; the hazardous material and how they would be abated in a safe and effective way, and again the traffic and cut-through traffic that could result in the surrounding neighborhood. He stated that he was partially in favor of affordable housing, but that short of that he would not be able to support this project at this time.

Commissioner Bernier was originally called on to speak earlier but had asked to go last. When it was her turn to speak she indicated that she wished to go last so that she could hear what her colleagues had to say, since they had not been able to discuss it due to the Brown Act requirement.

She agreed with Vice Chair Manley that we need affordable housing, and concurred with Commissioner Munoz that there is no way around that. We will be tasked to address it moving forward.

She agreed with Commissioner Powell that traffic is a hard thing. She indicated that she has gone through many projects during her five years on the Commission and that she analyzes all of them for what we need in the community. "This is our job and we don't take it lightly". She noted that the Commissioners are all volunteer residents, some who have lived here many decades.

She summed up by saying that she feels there was room where this project could be better, but that she had a hard time with the environmental impact of this project and would have to vote no.

The Chair asked for a motion.

Moved by Commissioner Bernier, seconded by Commissioner Munoz, approving a motion of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra directing staff to prepare a resolution for Commission consideration recommending that the City Council Deny General Plan Amendment 18-01.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: BERNIER, MUNOZ, POWELL, NIGSARIAN  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: MANLEY  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Moved by Commissioner Powell, seconded by Commissioner Bernier, approving a motion of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra directing staff to prepare a resolution for the Commission consideration not certifying the FEIR and recommending that the City Council also not certify the FEIR and determine the project exemptions based on the denial of the project (SCH #2015111045).

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: POWELL, BERNIER, MUNOZ, NIGSARIAN  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: MANLEY  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Moved by Chair Nigsarian, seconded by Commissioner Powell, approving a motion of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra directing staff to prepare a resolution for Commission consideration recommending that the City Council deny Amendment #3 to the La Habra Hills Specific Plan.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NIGSARIAN, POWELL, MUNOZ, MANLEY, BERNIER  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Moved by Commissioner Munoz, seconded by Commissioner Bernier, approving a motion of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra directing staff to prepare a resolution for Commission consideration recommending that the City Council not adopt the Rancho La Habra Specific Plan.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: MUNOZ, BERNIER, POWELL, MANLEY, NIGSARIAN  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Moved by Commissioner Bernier, seconded by Commissioner Munoz, approving a motion of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra directing staff to prepare a resolution for Commission consideration recommending that the City Council Deny Zone Change 18-01 changing the zone from La Habra Hills Specific Plan to Rancho La Habra Specific Plan.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: BERNIER, MUNOZ, POWELL, MANLEY, NIGSARIAN  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Moved by Chair Nigsarian, seconded by Commissioner Bernier, approving a motion of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra directing staff to prepare a resolution for Commission consideration denying vesting Tentative Tract Map 17845.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: NIGSARIAN, BERNIER, MUNOZ, POWELL, MANLEY  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Moved by Commissioner Powell, seconded by Commissioner Munoz, approving a motion of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra directing staff to prepare a resolution for Commission consideration recommending that the City Council deny Design Review 18-01 through 18-05 for Rancho La Habra Specific Plan areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: POWELL, MUNOZ, BERNIER, MANELY, NIGSARIAN  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Moved by Commissioner Munoz, seconded by Bernier, approving a motion of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra directing staff to prepare a resolution for Commission consideration recommending that the City Council deny Development Agreement 18-01.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: MUNOZ, BERNIER, POWELL, MANLEY, NIGSARIAN  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: NONE

Staff directed Chair to adjourn to Thursday, September 17, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. to allow staff to bring forward resolutions for their consideration and vote.

Adjournment 10:17 p.m. to Thursday, September 17, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carmen Gonzalez Avila  
Planning Commission Secretary